

## **Remarks**

### **General Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request that the above amendments be entered and further request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of the claims.

### **Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-20 were pending prior to the Office Action and were rejected. Claims 1-20 are rejected. In this response, claims 13 and 14 are amended. Claim 1-20 are pending.

### **Objections to Claims**

The Examiner has objected to claim 13 due to informalities. Applicants have amended claim 13 so that it now ends with a period, as the Examiner requested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to amended claim 13.

### **Rejections of Claims**

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to the use of the term “generally.” Applicants have amended claim 14 to remove the word “generally,” and as such, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lafleur (US 7,123,248) in view of Trotter et al. (US 6,903,706). Claim 15 is additionally rejected in view of Reichle (US 2005/0118880).

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that

claim against the prior art.” In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The combination of Lafleur and Trotter fails to teach or suggest the element of “a single display device connector in communication with the graphics processing unit,” as required by independent claims 1, 8, and 13.

The Specification states in paragraph [0012], “Single display device connectors are defined as display device connectors that were originally designed to independently control only a single display device.” An advantage of having multiple display devices connected to a single display device connector (in a video display controller) having communication with the graphics processing unit is that this “allows the information handling system to have multiple display devices without using more interior space or exterior surface area for mounting additional display device connectors.” (Spec., [0011]) In embodiments of the present invention, the housing 212 of the information handling system contains only one single-display connector, thereby saving valuable space within the housing.

In contrast to the embodiments of the present invention, the combination of Lafleur and Trotter fails to teach or suggest a single display device connector. The Examiner points to Figure 3, element 6 in Lafleur as teaching a single display device connector. However, element 6 of Lafleur is not a single display device connector, a display device connector that was originally designed to independently control only a single display device, as defined in the Specification of the present invention. Specifically, Lafleur refers to element 6 as a “multi-channel coupler” to which “one or more display monitors 16 can be coupled...” (Lafleur, col.4, lines 45-49) Thus, element 6 was not originally designed to independently control *only a single*

*display device*, and element 6 is not a single display device connector, as required by the independent claims. Trottier does not disclose this element either, as Trottier teaches a TMDS serializer having *dual* channels to provide an output to *two* displays. (Abstract) Thus, Trottier fails to remedy the deficiency of Lafleur.

The combination of Lafleur and Trottier fails to teach or suggest a single display device connector in communication with the graphics processing unit, as required by independent claims 1, 8, and 13. Thus, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established, and the independent claims are not obvious over the combination of Lafleur and Trottier. Additionally the dependent claims are also nonobvious because they depend from nonobvious independent claims.

### Conclusion

In light of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections. Applicants further submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicit timely notice of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney of record by telephone, facsimile, or electronic mail.

Applicants believe that there are no fees due in association with the filing of this Amendment and Response. However, should the Commissioner deem that any fees are due, including any fees for extensions of time, Applicants respectfully requests that the Commission accept this as a Petition Therefor, and direct that any additional fees be charged to Baker Botts L.L.P. Deposit Account No. 02-0383, Order Number 016295.1517.

Respectfully submitted,

/Bradley S. Bowling/  
Bradley S. Bowling  
Reg. No. 52,641  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
910 Louisiana  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 229-1802  
Facsimile: (713) 229-7702  
E.Mail: brad.bowling@bakerbotts.com  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Date: August 6, 2007